

4.8.2006 Present: Mr. Sanjay Dutt Vasudeva, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Chandel, Advocate General, with Mr. J.K. Verma, Deputy Advocate General, for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.3.

Through the present writ petition, under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, the writ petitioner has laid challenge to an order of the State Administrative Tribunal passed in OA (D) No.261 of 2001, on 23rd December 2004, whereby his Original Application, seeking a direction to his employer, i.e. respondent No.3 to regularize his services on completion of eight years of service as Supervisor instead of Mate because he had worked as Supervisor for a period of eight years and had completed 240 days in each calendar year, has been dismissed.

We have heard the learned Counsel for the writ petitioner and perused the record, particularly the order of the State Administrative Tribunal. The State Administrative Tribunal has noticed in its order that the writ petitioner worked only as a Mate and not as a Supervisor and, therefore, he cannot claim that his services be regularized as Supervisor. Admittedly, the services of the writ petitioners have been regularized as Mate, on completion of eight years

of service. Since there appears to be no violation of any right of the writ petitioner nor does there appear to be any serious flaw in the action of the respondents, the Tribunal was right in dismissing the Original Application of the writ petitioner. There is no merit in the writ petition. Hence the same is dismissed.

CMP No.633 of 2006.

Infructuous.

(V.K. Gupta),
Chief Justice.

August 4, 2006.
(rc)

(Surjit Singh),
Judge.

